

China as a friend than to treat it as an adversary."

The Reverend Pat Robertson: "Leaving a billion people in spiritual darkness punishes not the Chinese Government but the Chinese people. The only way to pursue morality is to engage China fully."

And His Holiness the Dalai Lama: "Confrontation or condemnation: I don't think it works. The only practical way is to be a genuine friend."

Mr. Speaker, we know that the single most positive change in the 5,000-year history of China has been the economic reform, those economic reforms which have empowered hundreds of millions of individuals to be lifted out of poverty. It is the height of absurdity to send a signal attacking the one positive change.

We have found over the years, over the last decade and a half, that maintaining economic engagement has in fact led to the positive political reform that we all seek. We found that out in Chile. We found that out in Argentina. And in the Pacific Rim, we found that out in both Taiwan and South Korea.

We never thought of cutting off economic ties with any of those 4 countries, which had horribly repressive human rights policies. And what has it brought about? That policy has helped us improve political pluralism, human rights, the rule of law in those nations. And it will do the same in China.

If we are going to send a positive signal, we should be doing the very important things that we have discussed repeatedly here in the Congress. For one thing, \$22 million for Radio-Free Asia, which is included in the Commerce-State-Justice appropriations bill, is a request that is over that that the President has requested.

I want to compliment the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS), chairman of that very important subcommittee, who has led the charge to help in this effort supporting the increased funding for the National Endowment for Democracy.

I am privileged to work with the International Republican Institute, a very important arm of that. We now have over half a billion Chinese people who have participated in village elections there; and in 40 percent of those elections, we have seen non-communist candidates actually victorious.

I think it is also very important for us to send a signal to the other body. That signal is they should pass the very important China bills that we successfully reported out of the House of Representatives last year.

Maintaining this strategy of engagement is the wave of the future. We have to recognize that if we are going to do everything that we can to help the people in the United States and the people in China, we must maintain normal trade relations.

Mr. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I request how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE) has 3½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. CHRISTENSEN) has 4½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from California (Mr. MATSUI) has 6½ minutes remaining. And the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) has 7 minutes remaining.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, is it my understanding that if we have a call of the House that we would each have 4 minutes or less, depending on how much time we have for the closing presentations?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is not party to any agreement.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, as I said earlier today, the debate on the floor today is not whether China will get Most Favored Nation status or that same status by any other name. The debate on the floor today is whether Members of Congress want to associate themselves with a failed policy, a policy which in the last 10 years has seen our trade deficit with China increase from \$3 billion to \$63 billion projected for 1998.

It is interesting to hear people talk about normal trade relations, as it will now be called. As I said before, a rose is a rose is a rose. In this case, a thorn is a thorn is a thorn.

Because the fact is that the Chinese regime has already decided that we are not going to have normal trade relations with them. They have done that by having the Great Wall of China around their markets resulting in that big trade deficit, by using slave labor for export, by using transshipments to avoid our quotas, and by pirating our intellectual property in the case of software at a rate of 95 percent.

So they must be having a great big chuckle over there in Beijing to see that we are debating to give them what they have already decided will not be a normal trade relationship.

Let us hear it for a normal trade relationship. I hope we can achieve one. But clearly, we have not gotten from here to there with this failed policy of granting Most Favored Nation status to China.

I just want to talk about a couple things I have heard said here. I heard people say they are making progress in human rights because they freed a few political prisoners. They forcefully exiled those people. That is punishment. That is not progress.

That is why Wei Jingsheng has been speaking out since he came to the United States to say, unless there is a threat of withholding this preferential trade treatment from China, the hands of the reformers in the government are not as effective in trying to persuade the hard-liners to change. To change, to open the doors to the prisons of those who are still in prison from the Tiananmen Square massacre and many

from the Democracy Wall era, which is 20 years ago. We cannot put the Tiananmen Square massacre behind us until those people are free, until the exiles are able to return home and speak freely within China.

I have heard others say that China is moving on human rights because they are going to work on the rule of law. How the Beijing rulers must enjoy that one. In Chinese, it is the rule by law. And that can be very, very oppressive.

I have heard people say here that the President made great progress on the proliferation issue because of the targeting. They present that notion and then they belittle it because they know that that is not a summit accomplishment.

And what was really happening while the President was there? While they may have been not targeting us, China was conducting a test. And an official of our own Government said, "President Clinton said proliferation would be high on his agenda during the summit. And by testing this key component of a long-range missile when they did, the Chinese have made it clear their lack of respect both for the President and his message," they said.

Trade, proliferation, human rights. Let us have a normal trade relationship. Yes, let us use the leverage that we have to make the world safer, the trade fairer, and the people freer.

I ask my colleagues, is \$1 billion a week deficit normal? Vote "yes" on the resolution and "no" on MFN for China.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The call was taken by electronic device, and the following Members responded to their names:

[Roll No. 316]

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—408

Abercrombie	Bilbray	Burton
Ackerman	Bilirakis	Buyer
Aderholt	Bishop	Callahan
Allen	Blagojevich	Calvert
Andrews	Bliley	Camp
Armey	Blumenauer	Campbell
Bachus	Blunt	Canady
Baesler	Boehert	Cannon
Baker	Boehner	Capps
Baldacci	Bonilla	Cardin
Ballenger	Bonior	Carson
Barcia	Bono	Castle
Barr	Borski	Chabot
Barrett (NE)	Boswell	Chambliss
Barrett (WI)	Boucher	Chenoweth
Bartlett	Boyd	Christensen
Barton	Brady (PA)	Clay
Bass	Brady (TX)	Clayton
Bateman	Brown (CA)	Clement
Becerra	Brown (FL)	Clyburn
Bentsen	Brown (OH)	Coble
Bereuter	Bryant	Coburn
Berman	Bunning	Collins
Berry	Burr	Combest

Condit	Hoyer	Nethercutt
Conyers	Hulshof	Neumann
Cook	Hunter	Ney
Cooksey	Hutchinson	Northup
Costello	Hyde	Norwood
Cox	Inglis	Nussle
Coyne	Istook	Oberstar
Cramer	Jackson (IL)	Obey
Crane	Jackson-Lee	Olver
Crapo	(TX)	Packard
Cubin	Jefferson	Pallone
Cummings	Jenkins	Pappas
Cunningham	John	Pascrell
Danner	Johnson (CT)	Pastor
Davis (FL)	Johnson (WI)	Paul
Davis (IL)	Johnson, E.B.	Paxon
Davis (VA)	Johnson, Sam	Payne
Deal	Jones	Pease
DeFazio	Kanjorski	Pease
DeGette	Kaptur	Pelosi
Delahunt	Kasich	Peterson (MN)
DeLauro	Kelly	Peterson (PA)
DeLay	Kennedy (MA)	Petri
Deutsch	Kennedy (RI)	Pickering
Diaz-Balart	Kennelly	Pickett
Dickey	Kildee	Pitts
Dicks	Kilpatrick	Pombo
Dingell	Kim	Pomeroy
Dixon	Kind (WI)	Porter
Doggett	King (NY)	Portman
Dooley	Kingston	Poshard
Doyle	Klecza	Price (NC)
Dreier	Klink	Pryce (OH)
Duncan	Klug	Quinn
Dunn	Knollenberg	Radanovich
Edwards	Kolbe	Rahall
Ehlers	Kucinich	Ramstad
Ehrlich	LaFalce	Rangel
Emerson	LaHood	Redmond
Engel	Lampson	Regula
English	Lantos	Reyes
Ensign	Largent	Riley
Eshoo	Latham	Rivers
Etheridge	Lazio	Rodriguez
Evans	Leach	Roemer
Ewing	Lee	Rogan
Farr	Levin	Rogers
Fattah	Lewis (GA)	Rohrabacher
Filner	Lewis (KY)	Ros-Lehtinen
Foley	Linder	Rothman
Forbes	Lipinski	Roukema
Fossella	Livingston	Roybal-Allard
Fowler	LoBiondo	Royce
Fox	Lofgren	Rush
Franks (NJ)	Lowey	Ryun
Frelinghuysen	Lucas	Sabo
Furse	Luther	Salmon
Gallegly	Maloney (CT)	Sanchez
Ganske	Maloney (NY)	Sanders
Gejdenson	Manton	Sandlin
Gephardt	Manzullo	Sanford
Gibbons	Markey	Sawyer
Gilchrest	Martinez	Saxton
Gillmor	Mascara	Scarborough
Gilman	Matsui	Schaefer, Dan
Goode	McCarthy (MO)	Schaffer, Bob
Goodlatte	McCarthy (NY)	Schumer
Goodling	McCollum	Scott
Gordon	McDade	Sensenbrenner
Goss	McDermott	Sessions
Graham	McGovern	Shadegg
Granger	McHale	Shaw
Green	McHugh	Shays
Greenwood	McInnis	Sherman
Gutierrez	McIntosh	Shimkus
Gutknecht	McIntyre	Shuster
Hall (OH)	McKeon	Sisisky
Hall (TX)	McKinney	Skaggs
Hamilton	Meehan	Skeen
Harman	Meek (FL)	Skelton
Hastert	Meeks (NY)	Slaughter
Hastings (FL)	Menendez	Smith (NJ)
Hastings (WA)	Metcalf	Smith (OR)
Hayworth	Mica	Smith (TX)
Hefley	Millender	Smith, Adam
Hefner	McDonald	Smith, Linda
Heger	Miller (CA)	Snowbarger
Hill	Miller (FL)	Snyder
Hilleary	Minge	Solomon
Hilliard	Mink	Souder
Hinchey	Moakley	Spence
Hinojosa	Mollohan	Spratt
Hobson	Moran (KS)	Stabenow
Hoekstra	Moran (VA)	Stearns
Holden	Morella	Stenholm
Hooley	Murtha	Stokes
Horn	Myrick	Strickland
Hostettler	Nadler	Stump
Houghton	Neal	Stupak

Sununu	Towns	Weldon (FL)
Talent	Trafficant	Weldon (PA)
Tanner	Turner	Weller
Tauscher	Upton	Wexler
Tauzin	Velazquez	Weygand
Taylor (MS)	Vento	White
Taylor (NC)	Visclosky	Whitfield
Thomas	Walsh	Wicker
Thompson	Wamp	Wilson
Thornberry	Waters	Wise
Thune	Watkins	Wolf
Thurman	Watt (NC)	Woolsey
Tiahrt	Watts (OK)	Wynn
Torres	Waxman	

□ 1517

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). On this rollcall, 408 Members have recorded their presence by electronic device, a quorum.

Under the rule, further proceedings under the call are dispensed with.

DISAPPROVAL OF MOST-FAVORED-NATION TREATMENT FOR CHINA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the matter pending before the House, the following time remains: The gentleman from California (Ms. PELOSI) has 4 minutes remaining. The gentleman from California (Mr. MATSUI) has 6½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. CHRISTENSEN) has 4½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE) has 3½ minutes remaining.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Ms. PELOSI).

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, as the House is coming to order, as one who has had a long interest in this U.S.-China trade debate, I want to commend you for your distinguished presiding over the House today during this very important issue to the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I now have the privilege of recognizing our distinguished Democratic leader of the House, a champion for promoting democratic values throughout the world, promoting our own economy through promoting exports, and stopping the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT).

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I would begin my statement today with a question that I think all of us have to ask as we decide which way we are going to vote. The question is, if we had kept in place in the mid-1980s a policy of constructive engagement with South Africa that is very much like the policy of constructive engagement we now have with China, would not Nelson Mandela be the President of South Africa today, or would he still be in jail? That is the question.

I know no two countries are alike. I know no two sets of policy can be exactly the same. But I believe with all my heart that the policy we are following, which is basically a policy of saying that more trade, more economic relationships, more communication is sufficient to bring about real change in China, is a failed policy and it has not worked.

If you will, simply look at the facts. Let us first look at trade. In 1987 the trade deficit with China was about \$3 billion between the United States and China. Today it is over \$60 billion.

Our own Trade Representative has stated, as of this year, as of this year, that there is essentially a closed market in China to American products. Put aside the tariff difference. Our average tariff on their goods coming here, 2 percent. Their average tariff on our goods going there, 17 percent.

But put that aside. The greatest barrier to our products going into China are nontariff barriers. Our own Trade Representative has said that their market is essentially closed now to our products. They had been unwilling to meet up with our demands to put them in the WTO. They are simply unwilling to allow for fair and free trade.

So if my colleagues look at this in terms of trade policy, we are not making progress. We are going in the wrong direction. We are not going in the right direction.

Let us take a look at human rights. Again, no progress. The President was there, and I admire him for going, and I think it was right to go. But let me tell my colleagues something. The Chinese leadership is happy to have our President or anybody else come and make statements about human rights as long as they do not have to do anything about human rights. Talk is cheap. I am from Missouri. Show me. Nothing is happening.

One hundred fifty dissidents who were in Tiananmen Square are still in jail. Even as our President came to China, people were locked up. People were locked up for no causes. People were locked up because they dared to try to express themselves politically freely.

There are no human rights in this country. Every violation that could be made of human rights has been made, and there is no progress. Look at the record. If the policy were working, the record would be different. It is not. So if a policy is not working, we need a new policy, and I believe that policy has to have actions as well as words.

I respect deeply my colleagues who believe that more trade and more talk will work. I respectfully disagree. I do not think that anything but solid action will make a difference.

I want to remind my colleagues of what was said in the debate about South Africa in 1985. I want to read my colleagues a statement. One of our Members in 1985 said this: "South Africa is making positive and concrete strides under an American policy of constructive engagement. Given the progress already made and the virtual irreversibility of the trends, sanctions and other punitive activities can hardly be expected to produce more salutary results than President Reagan's policy of constructive engagement."

Our respected colleague, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), said those words on this floor in 1985, but